

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed October 9, 2008 noted that claims 3-18 were pending, and rejected all claims. Claim 3 has been amended and claim 18 cancelled, and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 3-17 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

Page 2 of the Action rejects claims 3-18 under 35 U.S.C. section 112, paragraph 1 for failure to provide an adequate written description. The claims have been amended and it is submitted the rejection has been addressed. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Page 3 of the Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 4-8 and 10-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Oda and Fujioka. Note it is assumed that the Examiner meant to reject claims 3-18 since they were the pending claims as noted by the "Office Action Summary".

Oda discusses an automated-teller machine with a camera capable of photographing, at the same time, the head and hands of a user operating the machine.

Fujioka discusses checking authenticity of bills as the bills are deposited.

Neither Oda et al. or Fujioka teach or suggest an automated teller that has a camera that "operates to capture a first image of said interior of said currency bill receptacle when at least a first of said plurality of sensors corresponding to the shutter detects the insertion of a hand of the customer into said interior of said currency bill receptacle; wherein said security camera operates to capture a second image of said interior of said currency bill receptacle when at least a second of said plurality of sensors corresponding to the currency bill holder detects currency bills being taken out of said currency bill holder after said detection by the first sensor, and means for determining if at least one of said currency bills remains in said bill receptacle after a customer has completed operating the terminal, and means for performing a corrective action on the at least one of the remaining bills in said bill receptacle in response thereto" - claim 3.

The dependent claims depend from the above-discussed independent claims and are patentable over the prior art for the reasons discussed above. The dependent claims also recite additional features not shown to be taught or suggested by the prior art. For example, claim 4 calls for a time out associated with hand sensors after which time out an image is captured. The prior art does not teach or suggest such. It is submitted that the dependent claims are independently patentable over the prior art.

It is submitted that the claims distinguish over the prior art and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112. It is also

submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 2/9/9

By: /J. Randall Beckers/
J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501